DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 858 24 HE 001 157

By-Morse, Chandler

Development and Evaluation of Models for Faculty, Staff, and Student Exchange between two Institutions of Higher Education. A Demonstration Project.

Cornell Univ., Ithaca, N.Y.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.

Bureau No-BR-5-1085

Pub Date Dec 68

Contract-OEC-6-10-073

Note-52p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.70

Descriptors-Development, Evaluation, *Exchange Programs, *Higher Education, *Interinstitutional Cooperation, *Models, *Negro Colleges, Personnel, Programs, Students, Universities

Identifiers-Cornell University, *Hampton Institute

This project examined the worth and feasibility of exchanges of faculty, staff, and students between a small Negro college (Hampton Institute) and a large Northern university (Cornell). The objectives were to explore ways to: 1)strengthen the quality of Negro colleges and universities; 2)stimulate constructive dialogue between Negro colleges and the rest of American higher education; 3)secure greater opportunities for qualified Negroes to study; and 4)broaden the social and cultural perspectives of all those involved in the exchanges. Models representing different types of exchanges were developed and visits were made to both campuses by Hampton's and Cornell's faculty and administrators for lectures, participation in classes, and comparison of procedures, curriculum, facilities, and equipment. Student programs involved semester study exchanges and various extracurricular activities. Planning curriculum and faculty development at Hampton proved difficult at first, but mutually beneficial working relationships were later established. The problems, mostly preliminary misunderstandings, were due primarily to the historical differences between the two types of institutions. Since the conclusion of the 2-year project, activities have continued and developed greater formality and depth of cooperation. Appendices included detailed progress and evaluation reports. (DS)

EDO 32858

BR 5-1085
PA-24
OE/BR

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 5-1085
Contract No. OE-6-10-073

DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF MODELS FOR FACULTY, STAFF, AND STUDENT EXCHANGE BETWEEN TWO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

A Demonstration Project

Chandler Morse

Cornell University

Ithaca, New York

December 1968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

HE 001 157

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

CONTENTS

Summary	I
Preface	1
Background	1
Report	2
General Observations	4
Cooperative Activities:	
Academic Areas	4
Administrative Areas	7
Operational	7
Program Coordination & Evaluation	9
Student Areas	10
Semester Exchanges	10
Student Activities	11
Student Administration	12
Analytical Review of Activities Undertaken	12
Problems	14
Strengths	15
Conclusions	15
Appendix A - Set of Progress Reports	
Appendix B - Set of Evaluators Reports	
Appendix C - ERIC Resume	

Summary

This was a research contract to examine the worth and feasibility of exchanges of faculty, staff and students between a small predominantly Negro college (Hampton Institute) and a large northern university (Cornell). The objective was to explore ways to (1) strengthen the quality of predominantly Negro colleges and universities, (2) stimulate constructive dialogue between Negro colleges and the rest of American higher education, (3) secure greater opportunities for qualified Negroes for study, and (4) broaden social and cultural prospectives for all of those involved in such exchanges.

So-called "models," representing different types of exchanges, were conceived and developed, with their effectiveness evaluated by a committee of three, chosen respectively by the cooperating faculty and administrators from both institutions and the Office of Education. The exchanges included visits by faculty and administrators from both institutions to both campuses for lectures, participation in classes, consultation, comparisons of administrative procedures, facilities and equipment. Students participated in semester exchanges both ways, and in visits by groups engaged in extracurricular activities such as drama workshops, concerts, etc. While these visits and exchanges were mutually beneficial, it became apparent that faculty and curriculum development at Hampton should become the principal foci of attention.

Faculty turnover at Hampton, and certain distrusts and frictions, caused by conflicting degrees of academic freedom, together with Hampton's lack of administrative depth, hampered the communication, detailed planning, and provision of adequate lead time needed to pursue these aims. Thus formal, well-planned, intensive forms of cooperation proved infeasible and extensive contacts were multiplied instead. Seventeen academic and numerous administrative areas were involved, with nearly 500 cooperative contacts being made. Informal discussions with faculty and students seemed to be the most immediately productive. Although short visits did not permit much of this, good rapport was gradually established. As exchanges continued and programs expanded, it was evident that many basic misunderstandings were eliminated - misunderstandings which had led to the institutions' relative positions in the first place. The effort has developed several strong faculty and administrative relationships, and has helped to promote understanding among all who participated.

The contract reported on here provided a good basis on which to build for the future. It afforded both sides an opportunity to meet head on in developing a joint effort. Since its conclusion, and with other forms of financial support, informal and long term activities have continued and have developed greater formality and depth of cooperation.

Final Report to the Office of Education

DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF MODELS FOR FACULTY, STAFF, AND STUDENT EXCHANGE BETWEEN TWO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

PREFACE:

This is a report on the research contract made to Cornell University for the period August 1, 1965 through September 30, 1966 and subsequently extended through June 30, 1967. Unfortunately, the report suffers inevitably from a lack of balance owing to the departure from Cornell of the principal investigator under the contract, Dr. John Summerskill, and similarly of the departure of Hampton's principal investigator, Dr. Hugh Gloster. In addition, Dr. Thomas Law, who acted as the Faculty Coordinator for the Hampton program, has also left that campus. To obtain effective review of the present draft by these busy men, one now President of the San Francisco State College, another President of Morehouse University, and a third Dean of St. Paul's College in Virginia, and particularly to obtain agreement to a draft acceptable to them all and to the present author, is manifestly infeasible within any reasonable period of time. The report is therefore submitted with the warning that it does not necessarily represent the views of all those who were intimately concerned with a program that, during its formative period, was financed in part from the above mentioned research grant.

BACKGROUND:

The research contract grew out of an informal agreement reached in 1963 between Cornell and Hampton to explore the possibilities of what was then called an "exchange program." Exchanges of faculty, administrative staff, and students, and joint participation in extracurricular activities, were contemplated. The difficulty was financing, particularly as the Office of Education, to which a request for grant aid had been addressed, had available at that time no funds directly employable for such a purpose. However, the Office of Education did have funds available for research concerning educational problems, and regarded the Cornell-Hampton proposal as offering an opportunity to explore a cooperative relationship on an experimental basis. A contract was therefore made for this purpose. Subsequently, in the Fall of 1965, Congress passed the Higher Education Act of which Title III authorized the appropriation of funds for Cooperative Programs between developing and cooperating institutions. Hampton applied for aid for the academic year 1966-1967 under this provision of law and most of the expenditures during that year were charged against the grant made in response to Hampton's application. Nevertheless, an earlier request to extend Cornell's research contract to June 30, 1967 had been granted, and some

expenditures were made from these funds. Both formally and practically, therefore, the activities of the two years of 1965-66 and 1966-67 are properly regarded as constituting the experimental phase contemplated by the initial research contract. It is for that reason that the following report covers both of these years.

REPORT:

I

It is well to begin by indicating that a significant change occurred in the conceptualization of the relationship between Hampton and Cornell during the two years under review. Whereas the initial conception had been one of "exchange" on a basis approaching something like equality, the program came ultimately to be seen as one of "cooperation" between the two institutions, with "faculty development" and "curriculum development" at Hampton as the principal foci of interest.

The reasons for this change were several and interconnected. The application form under Title III required discussion of matters that had not previously been considered relevant. It also required a reconsideration and redefinition of some of the goals and activities in the experimental program.

A second reason was that the Hampton Faculty Coordinator, Dr. Thomas Law, who assumed his responsibilities in February 1966, had a Ph. D. from Cornell. He was therefore specifically aware of the differences between Cornell and Hampton and prepared to recognize the legitimacy of efforts to reduce or eliminate some of those differences. At the same time, Dr. Law realized that there were historical reasons why this would not be easy and that, in any case, it was necessary for Hampton to define its own path of growth and development. More will be said about these matters later.

A final reason for the change in the character of the program was that the departure of Dr. Gloster and Dr. Law from Hampton and their replacement by Dr. Albert Berrian and Dr. Edgar Thomas meant that still a new point of view was brought into the picture. This point of view became evident at a planning session at Cornell in June 1967 in which Drs. Berrian, Thomas, and Law participated with Professor Morse and Mr. William Jones of Cornell. While the planning related specifically to the program for 1967-68, to be financed wholly under Title III of the Higher Education Act, it also represented a continuation of the two years of experimentation financed in part by the research contract to which this report relates. It was at this planning session that the group agreed to concentrate on faculty development and curriculum

development during the coming year. Administrative staff consultations, on a reduced basis and student exchanges to the extent made possible by the funds available from the Office of Education were also to be continued. Less emphasis was to be placed on what Dr. Law called "peripheral" activities. In addition, an increase in the number of Hampton graduates going to first rate graduate schools was discussed as a possible central objective and criterion of the success of the program.

As indicated at the outset, the reconceptualization of the objectives and the criteria of success of the Cornell-Hampton cooperative relationship was one of the two most significant developments of the two years under review. The other was a growing recognition on the part of the Cornell personnel involved in the program that the specification of things to be done should originate with Hampton more than with Cornell. This realization came partly from the increased familiarity with Hampton that resulted from the frequent visits of members of the Cornell faculty and staff to the Hampton campus. It came also from discussions of the Reisman Report with Drs. Berrian and Thomas. Finally, one of the Hampton exchange students at Cornell in the Spring of 1967 recorded her impression that we wanted to make Hampton into "a little Cornell" and argued forcefully and cogently that this was inappropriate. She noted that Hampton had certain well-defined traditions and aims, and that it performed a most useful function for that great number of Negro students who otherwise would be unable to obtain the education required for them to get decent jobs. Moreover, it did this inexpensively enough to make it possible for Negroes from low income families to attend Hampton, and that if Hampton tried to meet Cornell's standards of performance the cost of a Hampton education would necessarily rise to the point where it could no longer serve Negroes from low income families. She argued further that Negroes who could afford to do so, or who had the educational qualifications to win scholarships, could go to the northern universities and colleges in any case. In short, Hampton had an important service to perform in maintaining essentially its historical aims and objectives and should be helped to do so better, not be diverted from doing so. The need was not to make Hampton into a little Cornell, but to make sure that all Negroes with the requisite qualifications could come to Cornell and other institutions of like standing. Although the argument is not necessarily valid, at least in all respects, the point warrants serious consideration.

Conceptualization of a program is one thing; its implementation is another. Since the objectives and criteria discussed above did not take shape until the end of the two years under review, and since at this writing some of the implementary steps have not been carried out or evaluated, it is impossible to state exactly how the lessons of the past will be translated into performance in the future. There is reason for optimism, but also for recognition of the existence of difficulties. What some of

these difficulties are, and how they can perhaps be overcome, will be dealt with in the third section of this report. The second section, immediately following, systematically summarizes the activities carried out under the program. Further details of these activities for the period August 1, 1965 through June 30, 1967 will be found in the progress reports submitted to the Office of Education during this period and in the reports of the evaluators.

II

This section will summarize activities conducted under Cornell's contract with the Office of Education during the period September 1965 through June 1967. However, by necessity it includes references to activities financed under the Higher Education Act of 1965 as the two fundings overlapped during the second year of the report period. In fact, the second year of the program was viewed as transitional, a phasing out of the initial arrangement while developing the new cooperative relationship.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS:

It had been recognized since the early days of the program that a relationship of this type, between two institutions of disparate size and composition, would have to be developed in stages. This point was cited in several of the Progress Reports submitted during the first year of operation, 1965-66. An initial need was to acquaint the key individuals at each institution with one another and to determine the strengths and weaknesses of each institution as regards the capability and willingness of participants. It was also apparent that extensive experimentation and discourse was needed to uncover the most workable types of programs and to acquire a knowledge of each institution in depth before meaningful priorities could be established.

Activities in the two years under review included efforts in the Academic, Administrative, and Student Areas. In total, over two-hundred and fifty visits to the two campuses were made during this period. But volume alone is not a criterion of the value of this relationship. In the vast majority of cases these visits yielded new insights and fresh viewpoints.

ACADEMIC AREAS:

In the academic areas, activities involving members of the two faculties included consulting on curriculum, presenting lectures, teaching special classes, conducting seminars, advising on building and equipment needs, and helping to fill certain gaps in the faculty. Assistance

also was provided in the establishing of contacts in academic circles and professional societies . Although visits from Cornell to Hampton were the more numerous, a considerable number of Hampton faculty members visited Cornell.

In all, seventeen academic fields were involved. These were: Architecture, Art, Biology, Child Development, Drama, Education, English, Government, History, Home Economics, Languages, Music, Nursing, Physics, Psychology, Sociology, and Technology-Engineering.

Comments on the cooperation in a few of these areas will illustrate some of the accomplishments.

Architecture -- Six staff visits were made to Cornell by personnel in Hampton's Division of Architecture. These visits included curriculum discussions, staffing consultation, and planning to meet accreditation needs.

Approximately twelve staff visits to Hampton were made by personnel from Cornell's College of Architecture. On seven occasions the Cornell visitor conducted a seminar in the History of Architecture. These monthly visits averaged 3-4 days in length. The visitor also assisted in the acquisition of books and several hundred slides for Hampton's collection. In his final report he said: "Feedback from the students, made to me personally, regarding both the lectures and the seminars proved to me the value of our efforts in both stimulating interest in the subject of architectural history and providing certain minimum information on key figures and major periods of the subject." He recommended continuation of this form of cooperation until Hampton became able to engage a permanent architectural historian.

Biology -- A working relation was developed between the head of Hampton's Biology Department and a strong member of Cornell's Biological Sciences Division. Areas of possible cooperation in teaching, curriculum planning, and research were discussed. A second Cornell representative visited Hampton and presented detailed recommendations on the expansion and renovation of facilities and the acquisition of equipment.

Education -- This field, historically one of the major emphases at Hampton, had the most faculty visitations-- thirty-seven. Most of these occurred in conjunction with two conferences, one at Hampton and one at Cornell, which afforded an opportunity to review recent developments in the field and explore areas of mutual interest. The conferences focused on the need for close ties between Teacher Education and Liberal Arts. Many members of the Arts faculties from both schools were involved.

These conferences had the added benefit of bringing a significant number of faculty members together from each institution for the first time. There were open and frank discussions of curricula, research, and intra-institutional relationships.

Technology-Engineering -- A series of contacts involved representatives of Hampton's Division of Technology and representatives of Cornell's Department of Physics and College of Engineering. The Departments of Building Construction Engineering and of Mechanical Technology at Hampton profited from Cornell resources in the fields of Civil, Mechanical, Structural and Electrical Engineering. Eight visits were made, four in each direction. The following quotation from a letter written to his Hampton counterpart by a member of the faculty at Cornell gives some indication of the type of cooperation:

> "I am working now on the proposed curricula you gave me, and by the end of the week should have this completed, that is, any comments I might wish to make on the program as a whole. I will then proceed to block out equipment for the Machine Shop and Gaging Laboratory trying to select sizes that would seem suitable. I will be able to collect catalogs on this equipment and send them to you for your study. I will then see what can be found in the way of equipment catalogs in the casting, welding, pressworking, and materials handling fields. Along with this I will be able to make a list of recent films covering these areas, and particularly such processing as gear products, broaching, and the more sophisticated techniques. I would be glad to hear from you at any time you have comments on our work lest I get strayed into an area that is not in keeping with the general program. Thank you for a most pleasant experience on your campus."

In addition to this direct Cornell assistance, a second passage from the same correspondence reveals efforts to extend Hampton's access to further resources:

> "I am also enclosing a membership application blank for ASTME. You will note that there is need for some Chapter to sponsor the application. The Ithaca Chapter would be pleased to take care of this matter, and I would be pleased to serve as one of your references if you wish. If there are questions regarding filling out this application, please feel free to write me, and when completed, return the application and fee to me and I will process it through our membership committee. I would feel that you qualify as a senior member. I feel certain that the benefits from this society membership will be of considerable help in the new program you are planning. I might mention that when the members are not very

close to a Chapter, they may be listed as 'Members-at-Large.' From our map, it would appear that the nearest Chapter would be in Washington, D. C. although there is another one in Durham, North Carolina. You will be able to choose which Chapter you wish to be affiliated with or you may remain a Member-at-Large if you wish. You would always be welcomed at any Chapter."

The consultant in Electrical Engineering presented two 3-hour workshop sessions. Instruction was provided on the use of an analog computer to solve differential equations. A desk-top analog computer and seven patch boards were taken from Cornell to Hampton for this purpose.

ADMINISTRATIVE AREAS:

Administrative cooperation occurred in three areas: operational, program coordination, and evaluation. In total, there were 35 administrative contacts. The following comments describe work in these areas:

OPERATIONAL -- This heading includes Library Administration, Public Relations, Registrar, and Admission Office. Of the 18 contacts made, about half were by Library administrators.

Library -- A section of the report submitted by the Director and Associate Director of Libraries at Cornell following their initial visit to Hampton reveals the nature of the consultation.

"This discussion with the library staff included the entire range of library problems from comments on the volume of use, the condition and quality of the book collection, the amount of book, periodical and binding funds available through to details of library operations and including consideration of space needs and the proposed addition to the library."

One of the report's closing paragraphs indicates the level and degree of interest in these discussions.

"At the close of our visit we had an opportunity to spend a few minutes with President Holland alone and we complimented him on the selection of the Director of the Library since he seemed to us to have a very good grasp of the problems and to be working effectively toward their solution. We also took this occasion to tell President Holland that the library staff as a whole had made a very favorable impression and we felt that anything the University Administration could do to include the professional librarians more completely in the academic life of the community would not only be

appreciated by the staff but would result in better library service to the Institute. It is hoped that several members of the library staff may be able to visit Cornell during the Spring."

A portion of a similar report by the Cornell Library Director on the occasion of the visit of Hampton's Librarian to Cornell adds further insight.

> "At Cornell, Mr. Davis and Professor Moses wished to discuss with us the remodeling and rearranging of space in the existing building in order to achieve the best functional arrangement. We spent Tuesday afternoon and Wednesday morning working through /architect's sketches of/ the two floors of the building and developing a plan for the use of space. Mr. Moses was particularly helpful because he could advise us as to the changes that were possible within the existing structure and he could also translate our suggestions into rough sketches. This task was completed shortly before noon on Wednesday.
>
> "We have since had a letter from Mr. Davis telling us that the plans for remodeling the building were well received by members of his staff when he presented them and also saying that he felt his trip to Cornell had been very useful in giving him specific ideas which he could apply at Hampton and, more generally, in giving him a better understanding of the kinds and depths of services that an academic library might render."

Subsequently, the entire Hampton professional library staff visited Cornell one at a time. Comments by one of these visitors are pertinent:

> "During each tour I had the opportunity to examine collections, ask questions as I observed staff members at work, and to consult with the heads of the various Reference Departments and collections. It was very encouraging to see familiar titles on the shelves, to note objectives and procedures with which Huntington Library compares favorably. However, I observed many practices that may be implemented here at Hampton Institute which may tend to improve its library service."

Other Administrators -- Contacts in the area of Public Relations were made on two occasions. These included discussions of press releases, publications and Centennial Planning as well as observation of the functioning of Cornell's News Bureau. Following appointment of a new Registrar-Admissions Director at Hampton, this individual came to Cornell, attended an Admissions Office conference and spent time with the Registrar's staff, acquainting himself with the management of that

office.

PROGRAM COORDINATION and EVALUATION--Approximately 20 contacts are classifiable under this heading. These included several discussions of the program by the Presidents of the two institutions, numerous detailed working sessions between the program coordinators, and visitations by those selected to evaluate the program.

Program Coordination -- This role consisted of inventorying the needs and resources of each institution and the scheduling of events which could most effectively bring them together. It also necessarily involved the arranging of travel accommodations, the writing of reports, the planning of program details, and the drafting of budgets.

Program Evaluation -- Three site visitations and meeting sessions were conducted by those evaluating the program during its initial year of operation. A report was filed by the Evaluators after each session. A portion of the conclusion to the third report, dated June 25, 1966, presents the views of these Evaluators on the strengths, weaknesses and potentials of this effort.

"Given the past achievements, present leadership and future plans we believe this exchange has been a good investment in American education and, at present, holds a bright promise for helping to develop both schools.

"We close this report with a few words on what we consider to be the most basic problems created by an exchange of this type. A university is a large complex organization of specialists with a multitude of resources, usually with well-established procedures for decentralized decision-making and a long tradition of academic freedom. A college, on the other hand, is more likely to have modest resources, a greater unity of purpose, more centralized administrative procedures, and less specialization among its faculty. These differences create organizational problems. Who is the college business manager's counterpart in the University? Does the dean of a university arts college face the same problems as a humanities division head? And there are more subtle problems. Should the college administrator seek to emulate the diversity of a university in curriculum and procedure or should he seek to give his college and students a more unified direction? Can a university faculty member prescribe viable alternatives to fit a college's needs? Can a university representative aid a college colleague without challenging his competence?

"To these must be added the problems arising from relating a predominantly Negro institution to one more in the mainstream of American academic life. The differences here are immediately

obvious but the subtleties which comprise them frequently are even more difficult to sense than to state. To deal with them reasonably the University man must be sensitive and willing to learn. He must want to help not out of duty or because of social pressure or personal advantages, but because of his commitment as an educator. On the other hand, his smaller college colleague also must recognize that his University counterpart must find satisfactions from his physical, mental, and, yes, emotional involvement in the exchange, and that change is the consequence of successful effort. Tact, understanding, humility, wisdom, effort, patience: these are the ingredients for a successful exchange, at once the goals of effective teaching and meaningful living.

"The Cornell-Hampton exchange is one of over a dozen now existing. The new interest in civil rights, Title III of the 1965 Higher Education Act, the successes of the Peace Corps and Vista are forces certain to increase the number. This exchange, although relatively successful, has brought to light certain features which might be applicable to other exchanges, but it certainly has not exhausted the possible ways such relationships can be arranged. Imaginative experimentation should characterize the exchanges of the next few years for, in time, the better predominantly Negro colleges might well provide help for many of the developing smaller colleges of the nation. Now, however, we conclude that an exchange is likely to be successful if those involved view the enterprise as an educational problem, and they are sensitive to differences, thoughtful about solutions, and funded at a sufficient level to be effective."

STUDENT AREAS:

Activity areas involving or related to students were: semester exchanges, student activities, and student affairs administration. With 170 students participating, this part of the program had a particularly broad impact.

Semester Exchanges -- During the spring terms of 1966 and 1967, sixteen Hampton students successfully completed a semester's work at Cornell and five Cornell students did likewise at Hampton.

The financial arrangement was governed by an initial procedure established to insure that costs over and above the amount which the student normally paid at his home institution were covered by the grant (with a modest allowance included in the computation to cover the incremental costs of relocation).

The Hampton students coming to Cornell enrolled in several of the undergraduate colleges. The College of Arts and Sciences had the

largest number with ten students. Home Economics had three, Architecture, two and the School of Industrial and Labor Relations, one. Courses were taken over a wide range of subjects depending on the major field of study. Students were encouraged to take courses that might not be available at Hampton.

The Cornell students going to Hampton pursued programs in the area of Liberal Arts. They also took courses of a kind not available at Cornell, such as, The Negro in American Literature, Modern Africa, The Negro in American History, and African History.

Both groups of students turned in good academic performances. The grade point average for the sixteen Hampton students at Cornell was 2.37 (on a possible 4.0 scale). The range of grades was from 1.60 to 3.10 and the median grade was 2.32. The Cornell students at Hampton, on an alphabetic grading system, averaged B+ with a range from C+ to A.

On the basis of close personal contact, interviews and letters there is evidence that the students from both institutions benefited by the change of environment afforded by the exchange. This is not to say that everything went smoothy. At Cornell a few cases were reported of difficulties in living arrangements. One Hampton student, in particular, felt that others in the house were avoiding contact and showing different treatment because of race. A suggested change of residence was turned down when the suggestion led to the student's discovery that the problem had been largely one of communication. It then proved possible to make the situation tolerable all round.

Student Activities -- These activities consisted of drama presentations, debate team encounters, student newspaper staff visits, and a joint choral group presentation.

A dramatic reading, "One Fell on Fertile Ground," was presented by Hampton students at Cornell in October of 1965. The students and staff on this occasion were engaged in special seminar discussions by their hosts from the Cornell drama department and some attended classes. In Marcy of 1967, the Cornell Dramatic Club presented a performance of "The Knack" at Hampton.

The Debate Teams met not only for encounters but also to exchange ideas concerning the organization and structuring of that activity. Representatives of the Hampton newspaper staff visited Cornell and observed the full operation of the daily paper. They also were able to cover and represent Hampton at a student conference on Vietnam which was being held at that time.

The Hampton Choir and Cornell Glee Club gave a joint concert at Cornell's 1967 Parents' Weekend. The Cornell Daily Sun of April 24, 1967, called the Hampton Choir "lively and happy" and remarked that the two organizations managed "to fill a three-quarter full Bailey Hall with vocal arrangements which were spirited, somber, or reflective - but always competent."

Student Administration -- Both the Dean of Men and the Dean of Women from Hampton came to Cornell to view and compare the campus environments. The Cornell Dean of Students and two of his staff visited Hampton. Opportunities were provided to meet with students, dormitory counselors and administrative staffs to discuss trends and research in student regulatory matters, counseling and guidance.

ANALYTICAL REVIEW OF THE ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN:

With three exceptions, all of the activities envisaged in the initial proposal were carried out, as were some that had not been envisaged. The three exceptions were the proposals (a) to have faculty members visit the exchange campus for the purpose of giving one-or-two week seminars, (b) for faculty visits for a regular or summer session to teach courses, and (c) for administrators to work for extended periods such as a semester or year on the exchange campus. The additional activities involved student groups.

The difficulties of getting down to planning the details of the excepted activities, and also of provising sufficient lead time, were responsible for these omissions. The fact that the Hampton and Cornell faculty members and administrators who might have been involved were unacquainted with each other, with course coverages, with student expectations, and with institutional practices, together with high faculty turnover and an overloaded administrative staff at Hampton, prevented the initiation of full and free discussion of Hampton's needs as envisaged in the statement of the Proposal's objectives (p. 1, para. (a)). Hence it proved necessary to confine faculty and administrative activities to a series of short term visits for the purpose of giving lectures, teaching classes, and consulting with opposite numbers. Once this necessity was recognized its virtue became apparent - namely, that the short term visits would perhaps be valuable as much for their contribution to establishing rapport as for their direct impact, and they were then promoted vigorously with this in mind.

To put the point another way, the difficulty of communication in depth between potential counterparts meant that only extensive forms of cooperation and exchange were generally feasible. An exception was Architecture, where the obstacles to communication were minimal and intensive collaboration in teaching Architectural History was arranged. Otherwise, proposals for intensive forms of collaboration, such as seminars and the joint teaching of classes, did not bear fruit. Instead, the simpler and more superficial sorts of short term visits were arranged in large numbers, the hope being that effective working relationships would evolve. The Progress Reports (Appendix A) and the

Reports of the Evaluators (Appendix B) show that the numbers of visits and/or the numbers of individuals involved under most of the activities carried out were, in fact, quite large.

The activities which were undertaken although not envisaged in the initial proposal consisted mainly of visits by student drama, singing, and newspaper groups to give performances, interact with their opposite numbers, attend classes, and the like. These supplemented the semester-long student exchanges, which were among the contemplated activities, and were carried out with considerable success.

Rather casually and inappropriately, the various activities envisaged in the Proposal were referred to in the Abstract of the proposal (p. 1, para. (b)) as "various models of exchange between the participating institutions, and the term "models" was repeated in the project title. While each type of exchange did, in a sense, represent an experiment with a different kind of activity, and thus a different "model," the scope of each type of exchange and the differences among them were too small to justify use of this term, which connotes something far more highly structured and controlled.

Among the inappropriate connotations of the term "model" was its implication that an elaborate form of evaluation, replete with "scientific" criteria and other formal research attributes, would be required. This was never contemplated. On the contrary, it was recognized from the outset that the main task of the evaluators was to determine the workability and the benefits of each type of exchange, and that they would "rely principally on data obtained from systematic interviews of faculty, staff, and student participants in the exchange." (Proposal, p. 7, para. D.). This is what was done, and is duly recorded in the reports of the evaluators (Appendix B). The evaluators - Messrs. Broadus N. Butler, Charles H. Monson, Jr., and J. L. Zwingle - were chosen respectively by the Office of Education, Cornell University, and Hampton Institute because of their broad individual and collective knowledge of higher education in the United States. Since the evaluations could not in any way be made in accordance with "scientific" criteria, the evaluators were chosen also because of their capacity for wise, common-sense judgment. Their reports reveal the qualities for which they were selected.

As the preceding analysis indicates, there was reason to believe that the extensive forms of cooperation adopted in 1965-66 would pave the way for more intensive collaboration in later years. This has proved to be so. At the present time of writing (December, 1968) it can be reported that during the fall term of 1968 a counterpart teaching program, in which a bi-weekly Cornell visitor and a resident Hampton teacher jointly plan and teach a course, became a reality in two subjects: English (three courses) and Biology (one course). Counterpart teaching of mathematics and Elementary Science Education were also scheduled for the fall but could not be executed for accidental reasons. The same is true of a planned exchange of instructors in spoken French. All of these unfulfilled plans are

are scheduled for realization in the spring term of 1969, along with English and Biology. Other subjects are under discussion. If cooperation under Title III can continue there is every reason to expect that even more intensive forms of collaboration will be developed.

III

Any relationship between two institutions varying significantly in size, racial composition, and geographic location is bound to develop problems. This one has had its share but has also developed strengths:

Problems -- The realization, pointed out earlier in this report, that the relationship must be developed in stages is very important. For many reasons, those who are administering a program of this type cannot sit down, draw up a list of activities and be able to commit their institutions without first undergoing an extended period of preparatory and experimental interaction. In this initial phase, leaders from both institutions must be brought together to not only decide what the areas of emphasis will be but to discover which individuals show the genuine concern and ability sc vital to developing joint efforts.

Some of the specific problems encountered by Hampton and Cornell were:

1. The high turnover of the Hampton faculty.

2. The long lead time necessary for involving Cornell faculty members in commitments other than those of very short duration, and Hampton's difficulty in meeting this need.

3. Friction and misunderstanding resulting from the strong tradition of academic freedom at Cornell and the absence of such a tradition at most of the predominantly Negro colleges.

4. Uncertainty on both sides concerning the proper (or desirable) modes of dealing with the other, coupled at times by a certain distrust.

5. The distance and rather poor connections between Hampton and Cornell.

Strengths -- Several areas of strength emerged during the Cornell-Hampton relationship. Some of these are:

1. Several strong faculty counterpart relationships have been formed and continue to provide assistance in the area of curriculum, teaching methods and materials.

2. The students at each institution who have been directly and indirectly involved in the program help to promote understanding and appreciation of the differences between the two institutions.

3. A close administrative liaison exists which provides both a sounding board and consultative services in areas of institutional operations and development.

CONCLUSIONS:

One of the conclusions that emerges strongly from two years of experience with the Cornell-Hampton program is that the difficulties and problems of carrying out such a program are due primarily, perhaps exclusively, to the historical differences between a northern university and a predominantly Negro college. The position of the Negro in American society has prevented the predominantly Negro colleges from developing the capability of competing for faculty, administrative staff, and students with the better of the predominantly white educational institutions. Yet there are predominantly Negro colleges, of which Hampton is one, which are educationally superior and better administered than a great many non-Negro colleges. Indeed, it has been asserted by a well-informed observer that in his estimation, Hampton offers an education that is about average by American standards. He adds, however, that "average" is not good enough.

The fact that one of the top Negro institutions is only average is a commentary on American society. For an average institution, desiring to raise the quality of education offered to its students, to be able to establish a cooperative relationship with an institution that stands near the top could be a significant fact. During the two experimental years covered by this report, much of the groundwork was laid for fruitful cooperation in the future. Much remained to be done to routinize and stabilize the forms of cooperation that had proved most promising, but the possibility of doing so could be seen.

The activities carried out during the current academic year (1967-68), which are financed wholly under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, suggest that the possibility is indeed realizable. They are narrower in scope but of greater depth than most of those carried out during the two preceding experimental years. Moreover, these activities, together with additional inter-faculty correspondence and consultation, create the prospect of still deeper and more productive cooperation in the future.

APPENDIX A
SET OF INTERIM PROGRESS REPORTS

HAMPTON CORNELL
Exchange Program Progress Report
Covering the Period August 1 - November 30, 1965

An informal Hampton-Cornell relationship has existed for several years. Relations were formalized with the approval of the present contract. The initial proposal was submitted to the Office of Education in August of 1964. It received preliminary approval in May of this year but it was not until late September that final approval was received.

In anticipation of receiving the approval, a visit to Hampton which might be designated as the first official activity during the contract period, was made by Faculty Coordinator Chandler Morse and Research Associate William D. Jones during the period of September 14-16. They were joined there by Project Director John Summerskill. In a series of meetings with Hampton officials, the scope of activities to be included under the program was outlined in a preliminary way (see exhibit A, Summary of Arrangements Discussed, September 14-16, 1965). The Hampton officials involved in these meetings included: President Jerome Holland, Dean of Faculty Hugh Gloster (Project Director for Hampton), Dean of Men, Thomas Hawkins, Director William H. Robinson, Division of Teacher Education, Director Edward C. Kollman, Division of Arts & Sciences, a number of department chairmen and several leading faculty members.

To date, in the two-month period in which we've had funds to operate, a significant number of the planned activities have been carried out. Several Hampton faculty visited the Cornell campus, have met with faculty groups in their area of concern and have attended classes and other university functions.

This has included representatives in the following areas: Language Department; The Drama Department; The School of Education; The Chaplain and The Music Department.

In Ithaca, the Hampton Players (16 students and two faculty) presented a dramatic reading and spent four days on campus. They attended a workshop, classes, a concert, toured the area, and participated in activities presented by Cornell students. Hampton's Dean of Faculty and the head of its Division of Education participated in a panel discussion."The Opportunities and Problems of the Predominantly Negro College" and also discussed their staffing needs at sessions arranged with Cornell department heads, faculty and graduate students. Meetings were held with Cornell undergraduates and college administrators in regard to planning the student exchange program.

Cornell visitors to Hampton have included Vice Provost Thomas Mackesey who lectured on "The Evolving Pattern of Higher Education" and also discussed Campus Planning with the responsible administrators; Professor Henry Detweiler, Associate Dean of the College of Architecture, lectured on "Archeological Diggings in Sardis" and consulted with the Department of Architecture; Professor Robert MacLeod, Psychology Department Chairman met with faculty and students and also consulted with Professor William Kearney who is conducting Hampton's self study program. Additionally, there have been consultations by Hampton with Cornell faculty staff on equipment and texts for Home Economics, on the development of a basic science program, and on Hampton library development.

To date, problems have been encountered in the financing of this program. Certain expenses of travel and per diem are obviously covered under this contract. However, other incidentals such as supplies and materials, telephone communications, and the considerable expenses of providing activities for visiting personnel have

been numerous. It is apparent that a portion of these expenses, which were not completely anticipated, will necessitate a reallocation of our contract budget (see Request for Reallocation of Budgeted Funds dated December - 1965) and the balance borne by the two institutions.

Another area in need of attention is that of appointing and activating the Consultant-Evaluators. One of the three posts has been filled and candidates considered and approached for the other two but not yet appointed.

On balance, there have been forward strides laying the groundwork for what appears to be a fruitful project in higher education. Many problems and details to be worked out are ahead of us but those involved feel equal to the task.

December 1, 1965
Ithaca, New York

HAMPTON CORNELL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Progress Report

Covering the Period December 1, 1965 - February 28, 1966

In spite of the fact that the period covered by this report included the Christmas recess and an extended period of severe winter weather, curtailing travel and impeding communications, there were several significant accomplishments for the Hampton Cornell Exchange Program.

In early December, Prof. Robert MacLeod, Chairman of Cornell's Psychology Department visited Hampton. During his stay, he gave a formal public lecture, talked at length with faculty and students in the field of Psychology and presented several informal lectures. Also, due to his past experience in such matters, he consulted with Professor Kearney, who is conducting Hampton's self study program, and met with committee members working in this area.

Early in December, Cornell appointed as its evaluator Dr. Charles H. Monson, Chairman of the Department of Philosophy, at the University of Utah and Visiting Academic Administration Fellow at Cornell. Hampton and the Office of Education had previously named as their evaluators Dr. J.L. Zwingle, Executive Secretary of the Association of Governing Boards of American College and Universities, and Dr. Broadus Butler, Special Assistant U.S. Office of Education. Early in January, Dr. Butler and Dr. Monson visited Hampton. Dr. Zwingle was unable to attend at this time but did visit the institute a few weeks later. While at Hampton, Dr. Monson presented a lecture entitled "Education for What", and he and Dr. Butler discussed the program with students, faculty and administration.

In mid-January, Cornell Prof. Edward Fox, home on leave from a year of sabbatic study in France, spent a week at Hampton lecturing, attending classes and

talking with faculty and students. Having been in France during the recent election, his presentation on DeGualle included up to the minute material.

During the period of January 16-18, an important step in the program was taken when Cornell Director of Libraries Stephen McCarthy and Assistant Director Giles Shepherd visited Hampton. In talks with Hampton Library Director Hillis Davis and President Holland, plans for the library, from book acquisitions to building needs, were covered. A return visit of four days by Mr. Davis (accompanied by William H. Moses, Chairman, Department of Building Construction) in early March enabled further discussion plus observation of Cornell methods and procedures.

The undergraduate student exchange was accomplished in early February after many weeks of planning and preparation at each institution. Hampton sent four girls and two boys who are enrolled in Cornell's Colleges of Arts and Science, Home Economics and Architecture. They are living with Cornell students in sororities, fraternities, and cooperative units. Cornell representatives at Hampton are three boys who were selected from a group applying from the College of Arts and Sciences after negotiations between Cornell's Advisory Committee on the Hampton-Cornell Program and the College Administration. Reports to date from both groups indicate that the exchange is a very worthwhile experience.

The final visit to report was that to Cornell at the end of February by the Chairman of Hampton's Department of Architecture, Bertram Berenson. His visit was at the invitation of Prof. Henry Detweiler, Associate Dean of Cornell's College of Architecture, who had lectured at Hampton in November. Further discussions and planning, aimed at assisting efforts for the accreditation of Hampton's Department of Architecture, were carried on.

A disappointment of the period was the collapse of efforts, due to the conflicts, to arrange a joint concert at Cornell by the Hampton choir and the Cornell chamber orchestra.

In the first six months of the exchange, a significant number of programs have been planned and carried out developing a sound base for continuing efforts and moving into new areas. At the time this report is being written, the evaluators are meeting at Cornell providing an excellent opportunity for review, appraisal and future planning of the program.

March 21, 1966

HAMPTON CORNELL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Progress Report

Covering the Period March 1, 1966 - May 30, 1966

With spring came an increase in activities under the exchange program. In early March, Hampton Librarian Hillis Davis came to Cornell following up arrangements made during the mid-January visit of Cornell Library Director Stephen McCarthy and Assistant Director Giles Shepherd. Mr. Davis, accompanied by Assistant Professor of Architecture William H. Moses, was given an exposure to the principal organizations and activities of the Cornell Libraries and continued earlier consultations regarding space utilization planning for a projected expansion of the Hampton Library.

During the period March 21 - 22, the three program evaluators, Mr. Broadus Butler, Dr. J. L. Zwingle and Prof. Charles Monson, met on the Cornell campus. They reviewed program materials; met with the exchange staff; lunched with the Advisory Faculty Committee; met with President James Perkins; and had a session with the six Hampton students attending Cornell under the program. The visit provided an insight into the exchange from the Cornell side after a similar exposure to Hampton earlier in the year.

At the end of March, Prof. Walter LaFeber of Cornell's History Department visited Hampton where he met with classes and groups of students. The theme of his visit was "United States, China and the Cold War."

In early April, Dr. Thomas Law, Hampton Research Associate under the contract, visited Cornell to work up a proposal to the Office of Education for future funding of the program under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965. He met in a series of work sessions with Cornell staff: Project Director John Summerskill, Faculty Coordinator Chandler Morse and Research Associate William D. Jones.

Later in April, Hampton Professor of Sociology, K. L. Sindwani visited Cornell where he met with Cornell professors and attended classes, seminars and lectures. Prof. Robert Palmer of the Cornell Music Department went to Hampton April 24 - 26, following up arrangements made during the Cornell visit of Hampton Prof. William Stoney. Professor Palmer met with Music Theory classes and lectured on "Significant Issues in Contemporary Music". At about the same time, Cornell Prof. Marvin Glock, specialist in Educational Psychology, visited Hampton at the request of Dr. William Robinson, Hampton's Director of Teacher Education, who had made the preliminary arrangements when he was in Ithaca in the fall.

At the close of April, Cornell Dean of Students, Stanley Davis,went to Hampton, met with counterpart Dean Thomas Hawkins and his staff, and arranged for Dean Hawkins to visit Cornell in mid-May. Through this relationship, it is planned to develop numerous exchange activities in the student activity area.

Other highlights of the program in early May were visits to Hampton by Cornell Professors William Keeton, Biology; John DeWire, Physics; Urie Bronfenbrenner, Child Development; and by Dean Muriel Carberry of Cornell's School of Nursing at New York Hospital.

An important visitor to Cornell in early May was Prof. J. Saunders Redding, Author and Professor of English at Hampton. Professor Redding visited classes, met with the Exchange committee and was a guest discussion leader at an informal evening student session which included the six Hampton exchange students.

Most recently, although following the period covered by this report, a session was held at Hampton bringing together the evaluators and the members of the exchange staffs of each institution. This presented a fine opportunity for an objective appraisal of activities to date and recommendations for future areas of emphasis in the continuing relationship. It was recognised that a first phase of the program, concerned with maximizing inter-campus contact, was coming to a close and that an even more fruitful second phase, with the potential of developing several areas in greater depth, lay ahead.

June, 1966

HAMPTON CORNELL EXCHANGE PROGRAM
Progress Report
Covering the Period June 1, 1966 - August 31, 1966

The best description of the period covered by this report is one of evaluation and consolidation. It came after the close of phase one, the introductory step, when the foal was to involve many different sectors of each institution with their respective counterparts at the other institution.

At the close of phase one, as mentioned briefly at the end of the previous Progress Report, a series of meetings was held at Hampton during the three day period, June 6-8. These meetings were structured so that the program evaluators first met with those concerned at Hampton; that group was joined by the Cornell representatives on the second day; and the third day was utilized for planning by the representatives of the two institutions on the basis of the recommendations which had been made during the first two days. A summary of these meetings is attached as a part of this report.

Shortly after these meetings, correspondence was initiated informing one or more individuals at each institution in over 20 subject areas of opportunities for new or continuing roles in the program. These areas were Mathematics, English, History, Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Psychology, Sociology, Engineering, Education, Business, Governement, Space Research, Architecture, Music, Speech & Drama, Child Development, Comptroller, Registrar, Public Relations, Student Affairs and Athletics.

In the latter part of July, it was learned that Hampton had received a grant under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 with Cornell named as the cooperating institution. These funds will assist in the continuation and expansion of the exchange program.

On August 4, the exchange program provided Franklin Weinstein, a doctoral candidate from Cornell's Government Department, as a visiting lecturer at Hampton's Alumni Institute. His topic of discussion was "The United States' Role in Vietnam".

On September 13, Dr. Frederick K. Tom of the School of Education as a speaker at Hampton's Staff Institute on the Improvement of Instruction.

The fruition of a program developed during the summer between the respective Architectural staffs at the two institutions occurred with the trip to Hampton October 4-6 of William Thompson. Mr. Thompson arranged for a series of monthly lectures on the history of architecture, the first one to be presented on October 24-25. In additon, he reviewed the slide collection and book lists at Hampton, suggesting items to augment both collections.

As a result of the communications listed above, responses have been received indicating that work is progressing on the following projects.

(a) A proposal for a continuing relation between the Department of Education at Cornell and the Division of Teacher Education at Hampton

(b) Biological consultation - Dr. Bonner, Hampton - Dr. Keeton and others, Cornell.

(c) Visiting Professors - for the spring semester, 1967: Dr. Frank Miller, Industrial and Labor Relations: Prof. Evelyn Stout, College of Home Economics.

(d) Dramatic Presentation - Performance at each institution.

(e) Debating team weekends at each institution.

(f) Student exchange of newspaper editorial staffs.

(g) Music department presentations.

(h) Athletic team contests

(i) Student exchange for spring semester.

In addition to those listed above, indications of continuing interest have been received from several other faculty and administrators. It is expected that these lines of communication will be kept open, projects will continue and new areas of cooperation will be revealed.

In closing a word of tribute is due to Dr. John Summerskil, who left Cornell late in the summer to accept the presidency of San Francisco State College. As one of the initiators of this program, his ski-led counsel will be missed. However, the close rapport which has developed between the two institutions should insure continuance of the progress to date.

October, 1966 Ithaca, N. Y.

REVIEW AND PLANNING MEETING AT HAMPTON INSTITUTE

June 6 - 8, 1966

A Report to the Cornell Advisory Committee on the Hampton-Cornell Exchange Program.

1. In accordance with the plans discussed last March the Evaluators of the Exchange Program (except for Broadus Butler, who had to be in Washington) met with Hampton faculty and administration on June 6, and were joined by Bill Jones and me on June 7. On the 8th, Bill and I remained to discuss future plans with Hampton officials.

2. On the morning of the 7th, Charles Monson and J.L. Zwingle reported on their review of the Program and their recommendations for the future. President Holland, Dean Gloster, Dr. Law, Bill Jones and I were present.

Charles Monson mentioned two sources of difficulty in conducting the program. One is that Cornell is a university and Hampton is a college. The other is that Hampton is predominantly Negro and Cornell predominantly white. These differences give rise to differences in outlook and operation that may lead to friction and misunderstanding. In spite of these problems, however, the Evaluators felt that the Hampton-Cornell program was unprecedented in its breadth and in the success with which numerous difficulties had been surmounted. It therefore provided a sound basis on which to build.

3. Looking to the future, the aim should be to achieve a maximum result with a minimum of strain. As a possible contribution to this aim, the Evaluators presented the following conclusions.

a. The use of Cornell faculty as consultants had been an unqualified success. This sort of activity should be continued and extended.

b. The use of Cornell faculty members as teachers and lecturers had produced more problematic results. In the first place, visits of only one or two days were seldom very productive of lasting results. The most valuable part of the Cornell visits had usually proved to be the informal discussions with students and faculty that took place, but short visits did not permit much of this. A certain number of visits lasting one or two weeks would be useful.

c. The time covered by the student exchange was too short and the number of students involved was too small to permit proper evaluation of this aspect of the program. However, the Cornell students at Hampton had clearly been well accepted, and the social aspects of their semester at Hampton had clearly been successful. They were variously earnest about the academic work, however. One clearly was rather uninterested in his classes, a second was quite serious, and the third was intermediate between these two. More attention to the academic interests of students selected for Hampton was perhaps in order.

The Evaluators had not had sufficient opportunity to review the records and reactions of the Hampton students at Cornell, but their impression in March had been that the students were "fitting in very well". They recommended that the student exchange be continued, and suggested that in about a year each Cornell and Hampton student in the program be asked to review his experience in retrospect.

d. Exchanges of student activity groups had been limited, but seemed to offer promising opportunities in drama, music, art, publications, student government and athletics.

4. The attendance of Hampton faculty members at the Cornell Summer Session no longer seemed worthwhile. It was recommended that this feature of the Program be dropped.

5. The use of Cornell as a recruiting ground for young Ph.D's appeared to have presented certain problems. Hampton not only obtained the person recruited but, in a certain sense, also obtained his Cornell "mentor". Consequently, if the arrangement worked badly a certain amount of embarassment was unavoidable. The Evaluators suggested but did not firmly recommend that efforts by Hampton to recruit Cornell graduate students be discontinued. However, it was agreed that the incidents of the past year should be reviewed and discussed before any firm decisions were made.

6. While consultation had been very successful, the Evaluators believed that in future it would be more beneficial if it took place to a greater extent on Hampton initiative. That is, members of the Hampton faculty and administration should determine the kinds of problems on which they would like to consult their opposite numbers at Cornell, and should then request the kind of assistance desired.

7. The possibility of instituting special one or two-week seminars to be taught by members of the Cornell faculty was discussed. Professor Monson indicated that at the University of Utah such seminars had proved quite successful, meeting five evenings a week between the hours of 7 and 10. For reasons that might not apply in the present instance, Utah ordinarily granted an hour of course credit for participating in these seminars. The grade given was simply pass or fail.

8. The Evaluators thought that in some cases it would be valuable for members of the Hampton faculty to spend a year at Cornell attending classes and participating in the life and administration of the university.

9. In general conclusion, it was recommended that greater emphasis be placed on the exchange of students and student groups, on the development of more varied consultation, and on more extended teaching by Cornell faculty members at Hampton, perhaps in special seminars like those mentioned above. The cooperating institutions were warned that it would be better not to try to do too much.

* * * * * * * *

On the afternoon of June 7, the meeting was enlarged by the addition of half a dozen members fof the Hampton faculty who, directly or indirectly, had participated in the Exchange Program. Each of the faculty members was called upon to comment on the Program. A brief summary of their observations follows:

Robinson: He had visited Ithaca in the fall and received Dr. Glock at Hampton in the spring. Both visits had been very valuable. He had talked with Dr. Glock about helping with the development of work concerning the applicability of the

psychological theory of learning to the teaching process and to testing it in actual practice. He intended to follow this up.

Kollman: The visits of Cornell faculty members were beneficial on the whole. In order to avoid the pressures at the end of the term, visits should be arranged for the early part of the semester so far as possible. He also thought that through preliminary correspondence between the Cornell visitor and his Hampton sponsors the visitor's contribution could be made more meaningful to students. For example, the visitor could indicate materials with which the students should be familiar in order to get the most from his lectures and discussions. Alternatively, the sponsoring members of the Hampton faculty could indicate the material their students had been covering and the sorts of new subject matter that might most usefully be introduced. It was also apparent that Hampton should provide more leisure time for the visitors.

The Cornell students, according to his observation, did not "set a pace" for the Hampton students and he was disappointed in this. He thought that the Cornellians took part in too many activities and that in the future they should be warned against doing so. Berrien, at this point, interjected a somewhat different view. He said that a visit by a couple of Cornell students who went to Hampton during the winter to look it over had indicated to him that they had a "treacherous predisposition" to think of themselves as "superior" and as not likely to be challenged in their classes at Hampton. He thought that this was not generally the case, and that any Cornell student would be challenged if he attempted to compete with the best students at Hampton.

Kollman in conclusion asked why Cornell visitors should also be expected to give a "public lecture". After some discussion, President Holland suggested that the Program "go slow" on the arrangement of public lectures.

Armstrong: She felt that there was clearly need for more time in which Hampton faculty and students could meet informally with the visitors from Cornell. Some visitors, like Bronfenbrenner, had had a "tremendous impact" on the students despite the shortness of their visit, but this was exceptional. More time was ordinarily needed. Because of his impact she would very much like to see Bronfenbrenner return. Other faculty members then mentioned LaFeber, Keeton, and Glock as individuals they would particularly like to have return.

Bonner: The program as a whole had been very good, but it would have benefited from more and better planning and coordination. He had talked with Professor Keeton about the possibility of some members of the Hampton biology faculty visiting Cornell, or serving for a brief period in some capacity. Arrangements like this could be exceedingly useful.

He also expressed a desire for consultation concerning the new science building. He thought that biology was perhaps not being provided for effectively. A physicist, a chemist, and a biologist should perhaps visit Cornell to consult their opposite numbers concerning the building plans.

Marine biology offered natural advantages at Hampton and it would be useful to have a direct contact with someone at Cornell who also was interested in this field. Conceivably some sort of joint research project might be worked out.

Wood: She wondered whether the visit of [redacted] had been part of the Exchange Program. She hoped not because his discourteous behavior had made an exceedingly bad impression. In general, she felt that the Hampton faculty and some members of the administration had insufficient information concerning the purposes and operation of the Program, and she asked whether it might not be desirable to put out a

brochure describing what the Program was about and how it functioned. There was clearly need for better communication concerning the Program to all those whom it might concern.

Berenson: He was somewhat uncertain concerning the implication of the term "exchange" in connection with the Program. It suggested mutual benefits, a two-way exchange of teachers and so on, but this did not seem to be what was contemplated. Morse expressed the view that, given the difference between Cornell, which was already in "the big time", and Hampton, which was trying to get there, it could hardly be expected that there could be an equally balanced flow in both directions. However, one could look to this as an eventual possibility if the Program and other factors were successful in reducing the differences between the two institutions.

Berenson also stressed the need to "involve" Cornell faculty members with Hampton students in a more effective way. He hoped that in the course of time there might also be closer relationships between the staffs of the two institutions, e.g., in the conduct of certain types of joint research.

Berrien: During the past year, he and the head of Wittenberg University's Department of French had exchanged places for a week. Two weeks would have been better. He wondered whether arrangements of this kind could be considered in connection with the Hampton-Cornell Program.

He also hoped that Cornell could assist in achieving a better preparation of Hampton students for graduate work, either at Cornell or elsewhere.

* * * * * * * *

At the meeting on the morning of the 8th Messrs. Law, Gloster, Wyatt, Jones and Morse discussed in some detail the activities that should be emphasized during the coming year. The following is a brief summary.

Student Exchanges

These should be planned again for the spring semester and efforts should be made to increase the numbers of students involved.

Student Activities

For the fall term it was thought that debating, football (a practice scrimmage), campus newspaper groups, student government officers,and student artists (accompanying exhibitions of their work) offered exchange possibilities. The individuals handling each activity at Hampton and Cornell were identified and responsibilities to get in touch with them were assigned.

In the spring term it was thought that dramatics, singing groups, and various winter and spring sports would provide opportunities for useful group exchanges.

Faculty Exchanges

Although President Holland had agreed that Cornell faculty visitors should not always be expected to give public lectures, Dean Gloster emphasized that this useful activity should not be wholly abandoned. Plans should be made for a few lectures on particular topics. The names of the following were suggested as possibilities:

Robin Williams, Steven Muller, Thomas Gold, Pearce Williams, George Kahin and J.W. Lewis.

The idea that we should try to organize several special seminars at Hampton during the academic year was approved. It was agreed that the topics to be covered by such seminars ought to be proposed by Hampton rather than Cornell. Law therefore undertook to arrange for preparation of a list of 8 or 10 desirable seminar topics in the expectation that Cornell faculty members might be found to deal with 3 or 4 of them.

In the field of consultations, the desirability of a Hampton group visiting Cornell to discuss plans for the science building was recognized. Morse agreed to look into the availability of people like Keeton, Plane, DeWire, and Rosenberg for such consultation this summer. Since Hampton is also planning a Student Union, Dean Hawkins would be encouraged to arrange for appropriate consultations on this building. Library consultation would be continued as necessary. The building for the proposed Student Health Center at Hampton might also be the subject of consultation.

Departmental curricula were another topic on which consultations might be arranged. Law undertook to invite various departments to take the initiative in asking for consultations of this type.

Administrative exchanges involving Messrs. Wyatt and Collis Davis and members of their staffs, and a possible visit by John Marcham to Hampton, were mentioned as likely possibilities.

Exchanges of persons concerned with students were also mentioned. Dormitory counsellors represent one possibility; Dean Hawkins would take the initiative. The Dean of Women might wish to visit Cornell and so might the Directors of the Health Service and the Testing Bureau.

* * * * * * * *

Towards the end of the afternoon of the 8th, Jones and Morse had a conference with President Holland lasting about two hours. As in previous sessions (including especially an informal meeting at Dean Gloster's house on the evening of the 7th), the discussions were frank. The difficulties of the past year were reviewed and the reasons for them explored. Since difficulties are almost certain to arise, in part for the reasons mentioned by Monson at the outset, in part because there are inherent complications and frictions in cooperation, a willingness and ability to speak frankly has proved to be and should continue to be an effective antidote to serious misunderstanding. So far as one can tell, no topics are now taboo between Hampton and Cornell, and it is expected that this will continue to be so.

In this connection, one point that was stressed in conversations with President Holland and Dean Gloster should perhaps be recorded. It was that the difficulties of the past year, in which Cornellians at Hampton and Cornell visitors to the campus were inevitably involved, could be traced in part to the disillusionment of competent and idealistic new faculty members with the academic atmosphere and the quality of some of the other new members of the faculty. There was apparently some basis for this disillusionment, since the heavy teaching loads and low salaries of faculty members (especially the newer ones) and the apparent lateness and unsystematic character of the recruitment process, inevitably mean that many of the new faculty members hired each year will be seriously deficient in competence or character, and that only a few idealists will have the qualities Hampton needs and

and wants. But the presence of the first group leads to disillusionment of the second, and little progress is made in building up the quality of the faculty. Sometimes the disillusioned leave quietly; sometimes they create incidents. In either case, Hampton is the loser.

To remove the above causes of difficulty it is necessary, first, to change the recruitment procedures. Being purely an administrative problem, the solution is relatively easy.

To raise salaries and reduce teaching loads takes money. Two possibilities were suggested. First, the amount of scholarship aid given by Hampton could be somewhat reduced; Hampton already gives much more such aid than its competitors. Second, a foundation might be approached for a grant equivalent to the aggregate salaries to be paid over the next ten years to members of the faculty who are due to retire in that period. This grant would permit the replacements for the retiring members to be hired now, instead of waiting. Foundations are usually interested in new ideas; this might appeal to them.

Finally, the possibility was discussed of making the Exchange Program the topic of Hampton's Faculty Workshop next September. (The Workshop is an annual affair). If this were done, it would be advantageous to have as many members as possible of Cornell's Advisory Committee, and other members of the Cornell faculty, participate in the Workshop. President Holland appeared to think well of the proposal.

Chandler Morse
Faculty Coordinator

June 1966

HAMPTON CORNELL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

PROGRESS REPORT

COVERING THE PERIOD SEPT. 1, 1966 - JUNE 30, 1967

The period covered by this report followed the receipt by Hampton Institute of a grant under Title III (Aid to Developing Institutions) of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Before this, however, owing to the availability of an unspent balance in Cornell's grant, coupled with uncertainty concerning the likely fate of Hampton's application, Cornell requested an extension of its grant. The extension was approved. When Hampton's application also was approved, management of the program shifted from Cornell to Hampton and reporting responsibility was taken over by the program administrator at the latter institution.

The following is a summary of the principal activities carried on during the period of ten months beginning September 1, 1966, when both grants were effective. Hence the activities reported on here have been covered in greater detail by the reports submitted by Hampton under its grant. During this period most of the funds expended were charged against the Hampton grant. The expenditures charged to Cornell's grant were mainly concerned with administrative and coordinating activities such as the arrangement of travel details, the programming of visits, and the handling of student exchanges.

Fall 1966

September 13 Staff Institute at Hampton: - Prof. Frederick Tom of Cornell delivered the key-note talk, dealing with ways of improving instructional efforts.

Monthly Series Architectural Seminars: - William Paul Thompson completed four visits to Hampton, each for a period of 3-4 days. He covered the field of History of Architecture and reviewed the slide collection and book lists, suggesting additional items to augment these resources.

November 28-30 Social Science Area: - Dr. Robert Johnson, Chairman of the Social Science Division at Hampton, visited Cornell to consult with

leading academicians in the fields of Economics, Psychology, Government, Child Development, History, Sociology and Philosophy. He also discussed areas of interest with the head of Cornell's Library services.

December 5-7 Technology Division: - key personnel in this area from Hampton -- Isaiah B. Perry, Chmn., Dept. of Mechanical Technology; Reginald A. Jackson, Dept. of Electronics Technology; and Henry L. Livas, Chmn., Dept. Building Construction Engineering -- visited the Cornell College of Engineering and worked out joint programs in areas of mutual interest.

1967

Jan. 26-28 Library Staff Visits: - Follow-ups on previous exchanges, which involved the Library Directors of both institutions. Librarians Thompson and Spence from Hampton observed methods and facilities of Cornell's Library Services.

February 2 Music: - Prof. Wm. Austin of Cornell visited Hampton. He lectured on Beethoven, with illustrations on the piano.

March 14 Hampton All College Assembly: - Principal speaker was Prof. Milton Konvitz, Cornell School of Industrial & Labor Relations. Topic: "The Jew and the Negro in Relation to Civil Rights."

March 17 Technology: - Dr. David J. Henkel of the Cornell Engineering College visited Hampton classes, meeting with students and staff. His theme was, "Civil Engineering: Problems Related to Geological History."

March 20-22 Biological Sciences: - A. W. Morrison, Research Manager of Cornell's Biology Division, visited Hampton to consult with staff regarding laboratory and instructional area layout for biology in the new science building.

March 31 Hampton Undergraduate Workshop in Elementary Education: - Prof. Verne

Rockcastle, Cornell, presented "Exploring the Fascinating World of Science."

March 31 City Planning: - Prof. Michael Hugo-Brunt, Cornell, visited with architectural staff and lectured on "The Impact of Colonial Architecture in East Africa."

April 4 Analog Computer: - Prof. Norman Vrana, Cornell College of Engineering, presented a workshop demonstration with this equipment. He also visited with students and consulted with staff. Subsequently, Professor Vrana arranged for a gift of this computer to Hampton.

April 12-14 School of Education Institute at Hampton: - A group of approximately seventeen faculty members from Cornell participated in a 3-day structured session. Representatives of Liberal Arts and Education from both institutions exchanged ideas on the topic: "A Union of the Liberal Arts and Teacher Education."

April 21 Hampton Choir: - A group of seventy-five students from Hampton sang at Cornell's Parents Weekend Program. They did several numbers, some jointly with the Cornell Glee Club and some independently. The visitors also attended Cornell classes and an Ella Fitzgerald Concert.

April 26-28 Technology-Testing Laboratory: - S. J. Errera, Cornell, consulted at Hampton on facilities and procedures for testing materials.

May 14-16 Admissions-Registration: - Prof. E. C. Kollmann, the new Hampton Registrar, attended an Admissions Workshop for Guidance Counsellors and consulted with Cornell's Registrar and staff regarding procedures and methods.

Spring Semester

Exchange Students: - During the Spring Semester, 1967, nine students from Hampton -- the Misses Vernal Copeland, Jackie Brown, Janice Wheeler, Gwen Jones, Constance Belton, and Ester Harber, and Messrs. James Crawford, Ronald Kopp, and Jesse Vaughn -- attended Cornell.

These students resided in Cornell living centers and on several occasions met with Cornell's Committee members to exchange views and offer suggestions for the program."

Two Cornell students -- Messrs. Donald Lifton and Nicholas Long -- attended Hampton.

APPENDIX B

SET OF EVALUATORS REPORTS

December 31, 1965

FIRST REPORT ON THE

CORNELL UNIVERSITY—HAMPTON INSTITUTE EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Under the provisions of Contract #OE6-10-073, Administrative Development Project K-003, Office of Education, a committee is directed to report to the United States Office of Education, Cornell University, and Hampton Institute an evaluation of the exchange program between the two schools which has been financed by the Office of Education. This constitutes the first of three reports.

The exchange originated from informal discussions between the then Cornell Vice President Keast and Hampton's President Holland during the fall of 1963. Further discussions between the Hampton faculty and administration and the Cornell President's Committee on Disadvantaged Students resulted in an application in May 1964 to the Office of Education for funds to support planning and development of the program. No action was taken on the request; nevertheless, the two schools went ahead with the exchange. President Holland spoke to the Cornell chapter of the AAUP; Professor Benjamin Nichols (Electrical Engineering) visited Hampton and arranged for many reference books to be transferred to the School; ten Hampton faculty members studied at the Cornell summer session with tuition grants from Cornell and board and room scholarships from Hampton; Dean Hugh Gloster spoke at Cornell; Professor Peter Kahn (Art) lectured for a week at Hampton; Professor Marion Smith (Drama) was given a Cornell fellowship to complete her doctoral studies; Professor Jessie Brown spent three days at Cornell with colleagues in English and teacher education. Approximately $20,000 was involved in these exchanges. In addition, and informally, students arranged an exchange, a girl going to Cornell and a boy to Hampton, each paying his own expenses for the spring semester, 1965. Late in September, 1965, the above-mentioned contract was received from the Office of Education.

Anticipating receipt of the contract a meeting was held from September 14 to 16, 1965, at which faculty representatives from both schools met to consider what specific exchanges could be worked out. The following programs were considered: 1) an exchange of undergraduate students; 2) faculty members from Hampton could go to Cornell for continued graduate study; 3) student groups in music, drama, debate, athletics, etc., could be exchanged; 4) faculty members from each school could go to the other to deliver lectures and conduct seminars;

5) visitations between Hampton faculty and administrative officers and their professional counterparts at Cornell to discuss curricular and research problems and proposals informally could be arranged. Specific names were proposed, but the details for making arrangements were left in the hands of Professor Chandler Morse and Mr. William Jones, who were appointed under the terms of the contract at Cornell, and Dean Hugh Gloster and a coordinator to be named at Hampton.

As of December 31, 1965, the following events have occurred:

1) Undergraduate exchange. Both schools advised their student bodies of the exchange possibilities and found considerable interest expressed. Hampton chose seven students acceptable to the pertinent Cornell departments who will be in residence at Cornell during the spring semester, 1966. It is not certain how many Cornell students will go to Hampton, for many Cornell departments, particularly in the College of Arts and Sciences, are reluctant to accept transfer credits, and students fear they may not have the semester count toward graduation. The successes or failures of this exchange, however, are still to be learned.

2) Hampton faculty graduate study. As previously noted, ten Hampton faculty members studied at Cornell during the summer of 1965. While the informal professional and social interchanges with Cornell faculty were judged to be excellent, most of those participating found the graduate course offerings too meager to justify a return. As a result, no exchanges were budgeted, although, informally, some Hampton faculty members indicate they will return for the summer session, 1966.

3) Student groups. In October, 1965, the Hampton Drama Department presented "One Fell on Fertile Ground" at Cornell. The dramatic reading was well received by the Cornell audiences, and the Hampton players visited classes, lived in dormitories, and were entertained extensively. All concerned thought the visit was very successful. Arrangements are being made for the Hampton Choir to visit Cornell in March, 1966.

4) Faculty lectures. Dean Hugh Gloster and Dr. William Robinson (Education) presented lectures on "Problems and Opportunities in Predominantly Negro Colleges" at Cornell in November, while Professor Henry Detweiler (Architecture) discussed "Archaeological Diggings in Sardis" in October, Vice Provost Thomas Mackesey discussed "The Evolving Pattern of Higher Education" in November, and Professor Robert MacLeod (Psychology) discussed "Recent Psychological Conceptions of Man" in December at Hampton. In each case the lecturers were on the campus

for two days, also meeting with regularly scheduled classes and talking informally with faculty and students. Professor Charles Monson (Philosophy) will lecture on "Education for What?" in January, and Professor Edward Fox (History) will spend the last week of his sabbatical leave at Hampton in January discussing his recent experiences in France, particularly the French elections. The audiences attending the lectures have ranged from small to moderate, but each lecture was thought to be well conceived and presented.

5) Informal faculty consultations. In addition to their formal lectures and classroom discussions, each of the above lecturers spent considerable time consulting with their professional counterparts. Professor Detweiler spent most of a day discussing the architectural engineering curriculum with Professor Berenson. Vice Provost Mackesey discussed campus planning with Professor Berenson and Dean Gloster. Professor MacLeod met with the self-study committee to help organize and direct their work. Each of these men has indicated a willingness—even enthusiasm—to continue the consultations; indeed Professor Berenson will be at Cornell in March. In addition, the staff in both Nursing and Home Economics at Hampton are continually drawing on the advice of their Cornell counterparts for planning and equiping new buildings. From Hampton, Mr. James West spent five days at Cornell with the Director of Public Relations; Professor Albert Berrian (French) spent two days with the Modern Language Department; Chaplain Vernon Bodein spent two days arranging the student exchanges. In each case the visiting faculty member reported he had gained many valuable insights and professional knowledge from the experience. Both the director and associate director of the Cornell library will spend three days at Hampton in January.

II.

To date, the most successful parts of the exchange have been the faculty lectures and visitations. The student exchange is still to occur, and the student drama, music, etc., group exchanges have not been sufficiently extensive to warrant conclusions. The Cornell faculty's lectures have brought knowledge indicative of academia's scope and standards to Hampton's students, although the lasting effect of these lectures is problematical. Perhaps intensive one- or two-week workshops would be more valuable. Moreover, the informal consultations with the lecturers' professional counterparts have brought not only useful tech-

nical knowledge and techniques to the Hampton staff but a different perspective on mutual problems as well. In addition, these visitations have had some much less obvious but nonetheless important side benefits: a number of Cornell's leading faculty members have become interested in the predominantly negro college's problems; Hampton has had an inside contact for recruiting outstanding young scholars from among those Cornell graduate students nearly finished with their Ph.D. requirements; personal relationships have been established which make a phone call for consultation purposes easier; Cornell faculty members have been able to identify outstanding undergraduate students for their graduate programs; Cornell staff and students have gained an insight into a hitherto unknown set of American social and educational problems.

The present exchange program rests on a large reservoir of good will and mutual respect which it has helped to create and foster. The representatives from both schools believe that every participant is both learning and teaching, and this appears to be one of the preconditions for success; both schools believe paternalism is not the way to approach this problem. The program has not suffered yet from Hampton's failure to appoint the coordinator budgeted in the contract, but the detailed operations of the exchange have fallen to Dean Gloster, thereby adding to his already extremely heavy burden of responsibilities. Hampton officials have assured the committee this appointment will be made in the very near future.

Broadus N. Butler
J. L. Zwingle
Charles H. Monson, Jr.

Second Report on the
Cornell University-Hampton Institute Exchange Program

Under the provisions of Contract #OE6-10-073, Administrative Development Project K-003, Office of Education, a committee is directed to report to the U.S. Office of Education, Cornell University, and Hampton Institute an evaluation of the exchange program between the two schools which has been financed by the Office of Education. This is the second of three reports.

Updating the Calendar

Since December 31, 1965, when the first report was rendered the following events have taken place:

1. Dr. Thomas M. Law, Director of the Division of Business, has been appointed Hampton coordinator for the exchange.

2. Dr. Charles Monson (Philosophy) visited Hampton January 5-7 to deliver a public lecture, "Education for What?" and meet with classes and faculty.

3. Dr. Edward Fox (History) visited Hampton January 10-14 to address the student body on "French Politics Today," meet with classes, and discuss problems of mutual interest with colleagues in the history department.

4. Professors McCarthy and Shepherd (Library) visited Hampton January 16-18 to discuss library problems and the proposed expansion of Hampton's library building. Professors Davis (Library) and Moses (Campus Planning) paid a return visit to Cornell on March 8-11 tc continue these discussions and to observe the operations of the Cornell Library.

5. Professor Bertram Berenson (Architecture) visited Cornell February 28-March 1 to discuss the Architectural Engineering curriculum and plan for a request to accredit the program.

6. Three students from Cornell, William Schneider, Stephen T. Honey, and Paul Ohlson, entered Hampton and six students from Hampton, Vivian DeLoatch, Helen Morta, Sherlow Pack, Roberta Watson, George Jones, and Ulysses Boykin, entered Cornell during the second semester.

The Evaluators' Second Meeting

On March 21 and 22, the three evaluators met at Cornell to discuss the exchange with those involved in the program. During these two days they talked with

all of the following: President James Perkins; Dr. John Summerskill (Hospital Administration), Dr. Chandler Morse (Economics), and Mr. William Jones (Registrar), leaders of the faculty committee in charge of the exchange; Professors DeWire (Physics), Nichols (Engineering), Austin (Music), and Vars (Education), members of the supervising committee; Professors Detweiler (Architecture), McCarthy (Library), Cowan (Linguistics), Albright (Drama), Seznec (Romance Studies), Demorest (Romance Studies), Hsu (Music), and Shepherd (Library) who either have been to Hampton or hosted a Hampton visitor to Cornell; the six Hampton students currently in residence at Cornell and Gloria Joseph, Counselor to Disadvantaged Students at Cornell; and Julius Twyne, a Hampton and Cornell graduate, now employed by the Cornell planning office. The Office of Education may want to reassure the Congress that its money is being spent frugally, for each faculty member, including the Cornell coordinators, paid for his own luncheons.

Following these meetings the evaluators spent some time together discussing the exchange and considering our future activities.

Achievements of the Exchange

The evaluators agree that, to date, the exchange has been quite successful. Contacts have been on a broad front touching on most aspects of the academic life. An interest and dedication to the purposes of the exchange has been created in many of Cornell's faculty. The foundation has been laid for what could be a long and fruitful exchange.

Moreover, the exchange already has had some specific beneficial effects. The planned library expansion at Hampton has been improved because of the consultations with Professors McCarthy and Shepherd. The architecture curriculum has been strengthened and the foundation laid for accrediting the program because of Professor Berenson's contacts with Cornell colleagues. Planning and equipment for the new nursing and home economics buildings at Hampton have been improved as the result of consultations. The Hampton students at Cornell already have caught the intellectual excitement which is part of Cornell's tradition. The Cornell students at Hampton have a greater understanding and appreciation of the predominently Negro college. In addition, there are the more subtle but important effects which the exchanged public lectures, classroom appearances, and informal discussions have had on both faculty and students.

Problems

This committee has discerned the following problems which should be noted at this time. First, the problem of follow-up contacts. Initial visits have been made by those in Public Relations, modern languages, self-study programs, drama, and music at which time problems of mutual concern were discussed, but no further contacts have resulted. In each case the Cornell faculty has been willing, even eager, to continue the relationship, but believes the initiative for doing so should now come from their Hampton counterparts. Planning for drama and music exchanges during the 1966-67 year should now be taking place. The Hampton self-study probably is sufficiently advanced that Professor MacLeod's advice could be useful. A joint undertaking by the two schools to offer a fifth year language exchange program supported by such a foundation as Woodrow Wilson could be planned, etc.

Second, problems created by the student exchange. Several students said they were disadvantaged by taking the second semester of a year's course at another school and suggested that a fall semester exchange, or a whole year, would be better. One student at Cornell has felt unwelcome in the sorority which agreed to house her.

Finally, some Cornell faculty members are concerned about the recent resignation of a Hampton faculty member, recruited by Cornell, because of what he considered to be precipitate dismissals at the school. Every one at Cornell believes the Hampton officials should not be advised as to how to administer their school, but the committee notes that this situation has made some Cornell faculty less willing to recruit their students for Hampton and hence has had some effect on the exchange.

Conclusions

Any human relationship creates problems, but the evaluators believe that, on balance, the exchange is fruitful for both schools. An increased understanding of mutually interesting problems and possible answers are being exchanged among faculty. Students at both schools are being exposed to new dimensions of learning. Technical and professional information is being shared. The leadership of the exchange is in capable and interested hands.

Hampton is applying for additional funding for the exchange under Title III, and this committee believes the money expended under the present contract has been spent wisely. We also believe that to make the exchange truly fruitful, the program should be continued for another five years.

Broadus N. Butler
J. L. Zwingle
Charles H. Monson, Jr.

March 25, 1966

Third Report on the

Cornell University-Hampton Institute Exchange Program

June 25, 1966

Under the provisions of Contract #OE6-10-073, Administrative Development Project K-003, Office of Education, a committee is directed to report to the U.S. Office of Education, Cornell University, and Hampton Institute an evaluation of the exchange program between the two schools which has been financed by the Office of Education. This is the last of three reports.

Since the fall of 1963 Cornell University and Hampton Institute have been exchanging students, faculty, administrative staff, knowledge, problems, and skills. Beginning modestly, the exchange blossomed into full bloom during the academic year 1965-66 when a wide range of visits touched on many facets of academic life. Hampton students spent a semester at Cornell while Cornell students studied at Hampton. Hampton faculty attended Cornell during both the summer session and academic year. Student groups were exchanged. There were exchange visits between faculty members in Education, Engineering, Physics, Economics, Home Economics, French, English, Architecture, Psychology, Philosophy, History, Sociology, Biology, Nursing, Music, and Art. These faculty members lectured to classes, engaged in informal discussions, and considered problems of mutual interest with their professional counterparts. The dean of students, director of public relations, and director of library services in each school exchanged visits. In addition, the two schools' committees exchanged several visits and numerous phone calls.

The evaluation committee has kept close contact with the exchange during the year, meeting together for a third time at Hampton June 6-7 to discuss the program with those Hampton faculty most affected, and with the committees from both schools. Following those discussions the evaluation committee met to consider what seem to be the successes and failures, and what general problems are created by such a relationship.

Faculty as consultants

This committee believes that the greatest value from the exchange has resulted from the consulting advice Cornell staff members have given to their Hampton colleagues and the knowledge the Cornell faculty learned about Hampton. Specifically, Hampton's library expansion and operation, new Home Economics building and equipment, Nursing program, and Architecture accreditation have been, and continue to be, affected significantly. In addition, contacts between those in teacher education, testing services, student personnel services, and public relations have been sufficiently sustained that informal consultation is continuing.

We believe that this aspect of the exchange should be broadened and strengthened, and that the initiative for determining the areas of greatest

need should be made primarily, although not exclusively, by Hampton officials. The Hampton faculty believe a minimum of three days is necessary for adequate consultation, and that a resident semester is best. Consultations should cover the whole range of a department's activity: building needs and facilities; entrance requirements; texts; curriculum arrangements; library holdings; equipment purchases; graduation requirements; and placement services. This can occur at either campus, although an exchange visit to both is advisable. Officials from both schools agree that an exchange of department chairmen and deans to discuss administrative problems is in order, and this committee agrees.

In these ways the varied and rich resources of a large university have been, and continue to be, used to provide information, alternatives, and counsel to a smaller college. We believe this facet of the Cornell-Hampton exchange has been an unqualified success.

Faculty as teachers

Almost every faculty consultant also has done some teaching during his visit to the other campus. Usually this has involved meeting two or three classes, holding informal discussions during the afternoon or evening, and delivering a formal public lecture. Visits were for two, sometimes three, days. All of the visitors were scholars and teachers of high repute, among the very best each school could provide.

The effects of teaching and lecturing, of course, always are difficult to assess, so this committee is not prepared to render a definitive judgment on this aspect of the exchange. Nevertheless, certain conclusions seem to be warranted by this year's experience. First, a one-day visit may be sufficient for a public lecture, but for teaching to be effective a minimum of a week, and preferably two, is advisable. For this reason future teacher exchanges might consider organizing intensive one or two-week evening workshops where a single subject could be covered in depth without drawing too much time or energy away from the students' regular course work. With proper planning a visiting teacher's specialties also could be made a part of existing courses, as teachers in home economics, architecture, and nursing are planning to do. Second, everyone agreed that the informal discussions were at least as important as the classroom presentations, if not more so. Third, officials agreed that they received very high quality talks at a modest price, and that the exchange supplemented significantly the regular lecture series. Fourth, plans were made to invite lecturers and teachers well received for longer stays in future years; thus, the exchange is serving a recruiting function.

The committee believes that this aspect of the exchange serves a valuable, if intangible, function and, when combined with the consultant function, provides the most fruitful aspect of the program. The more faculty members who can spend a week teaching students and consulting with colleagues at the other institution the better the cause of education will be served.

Student exchange

In 1964-65 one student from Cornell and one from Hampton changed schools; in 1965-66 there were three from Cornell and six from Hampton. Each student, of course, brought his own personality, expectations, and interests to the exchange so, even if the group had been larger, generalization still would be difficult. Moreover, the real effects of the exchange will become apparent only after each student has returned permanently to his own campus and a climate of opinion regarding the other school is distilled from their collective judgments. The successes or failures of this part of the exchange, then, are still to be determined.

At this point, however, we can say that with one possible exception all the students were accepted socially and intellectually on the other campus. The Cornell students did not provide the intellectual leadership some of the Hampton faculty expected, but perhaps others would. A comparison of grades from the other institution with each student's original cumulative grade point average is still to be made, but the initial impression among committee members was that they were comparable; interestingly, for both groups.

The value of this aspect of the exchange cannot be determined, but since it holds promise and since it has had no discernable detrimental effects so far we recommend that these exchanges be continued, perhaps expanded to a full year rather than the present semester.

Student group exchanges

Despite good intentions and some planning there were only two group exchanges: a Hampton drama group visited Cornell in October, 1965; representatives of The Hampton Script visited Cornell in April, 1966. At present, representatives from the two schools are considering exchanges of drama, music and art groups, student body officers, tennis and baseball teams. However, until more exchanges have occurred this committee believes no generalizations are warranted.

Hampton faculty studying at Cornell

During the summer term, 1964, ten Hampton faculty members attended the Cornell summer session with scholarship funds provided by both schools. Six attended the 1965 summer session under a similar arrangement. At present, two are planning to attend the 1966 summer session. The decreasing enrollment reflects the fact that Cornell's summer session is designed primarily for undergraduates and suggests that Hampton faculty probably can obtain more instruction in their particular disciplines elsewhere. Accordingly, we do not recommend this aspect of the exchange unless the University offers a strong graduate program during the summer term.

One Hampton faculty member was awarded a Cornell fellowship during the past two academic years and is making creditable progress toward her doctorate. One example is not sufficient for a generalization, but this form of

study seems highly advisable, providing Hampton can spare the faculty member and the candidate meets Cornell's departmental requirements. The provisions in the Higher Education Act Title III for faculty fellowships should help to make this aspect of the program much more attractive and feasible, and thus provide a sound method for upgrading and updating the knowledge of Hampton's faculty members.

Cornell recruiting for Hampton

In the early stages of the exchange, the idea that the Cornell committee could serve as a recruiting agent for Hampton was considered, and two young men nearing completion of their Ph.D.'s were sent to Hampton. In the spring of 1966 one of these men viewed as a violation of academic freedom the Hampton administration's failure to renew the contract of another faculty member (without tenure). His sponsor and others at Cornell became concerned about the status of academic freedom at Hampton, and tensions were created within the exchange. Since then the two committees have aired their respective views of the situation candidly and fully and agree it is a minor part of the total exchange, although a significant point, and a possible trouble spot in the future.

In the light of these developments, the committee believes that too many people, each with his own interests, are involved in this arrangement and recommends that it be discontinued. The Cornell committee, of course, should continue to serve as an information center for Hampton's recruiting on the Cornell campus.

Conclusions

On balance, this committee believes the exchange between Cornell and Hampton has been very successful. In addition to those features previously mentioned, the surest sign of success is the quality of the leadership guiding the program. At Cornell, Professor John Summerskill, Professor Chandler Morse, and Mr. William Jones have worked diligently and imaginatively to bring the finest resources of a large University to bear on the problems of a predominantly Negro college. Not only have they provided these resources surely and significantly, but they also have aroused among their colleagues a degree of enthusiasm and dedication to the exchange which should carry it forward for several years. At Hampton, Dean Hugh Gloster and Dr. Thomas Law have determined their school's needs and made effective use of the Cornell visitors' time. In addition, we wish to report that the program has been administered frugally.

Given the past achievements, present leadership, and future plans we believe this exchange has been a good investment in American education and, at present, holds a bright promise for helping to develop both schools.

General problems

We close this report with a few words on what we consider to be the most basic problems created by an exchange of this type. A university is a large complex organization of specialists with a multitude of resources, usually with well-established procedures for decentralized decision making and a long tradition of academic freedom. A college, on the other hand, is more likely to have modest resources, a greater unity of purpose, more centralized administrative procedures, and less specialization among its faculty. These differences create organizational problems. Who is the college business manager's counterpart in the University? Does the dean of a university arts college face the same problems as a humanities division head? And there are more subtle problems. Should the college administrator seek to emulate the diversity of a university in curriculum and procedure or should he seek to give his college and students a more unified direction? Can a university faculty member prescribe viable alternatives to fit a college's needs? Can a university representative aid a college colleague without challenging his competence?

To these must be added the problems arising from relating a predominantly Negro institution to one more in the mainstream of American academic life. The differences here are immediately obvious but the subleties which comprise them frequently are even more difficult to sense than to state. To deal with them reasonably the University man must be sensitive and willing to learn. He must have an interest without being a crusader, be helpful without being patronizing, be dedicated but not involved. He must want to help not out of duty or because of social pressure or personal advantages, but because of his commitment as an educator. On the other hand, his smaller college colleague also must recognize that his University counterpart must find satisfactions from his physical, mental, and, yes, emotional involvement in the exchange, and that change is the consequence of successful effort. Tact, understanding, humility, wisdom, effort, patience: these are the ingredients for a successful exchange, at once the goals of effective teaching and meaningful living.

The Cornell-Hampton exchange is one of over a dozen now existing. The new interest in civil rights, Title III of the 1965 Higher Education Act, the successes of the Peace Corps and Vista are forces certain to increase the number. This exchange, although relatively successful, has brought to light certain features which might be applicable to other exchanges, but it certainly has not exhausted the possible ways such relationships can be arranged. Imaginative experimentation should characterize the exchanges of the next few years for, in time, the better predominantly Negro colleges might well provide help for many of the developing smaller colleges of the nation. Now, however, we conclude that an exchange is likely to be successful if those involved view the enterprise as an educational problem, and they are sensitive to differences, thoughtful about solutions, and funded at a sufficient level to be effective.

Broadus N. Butler
Charles H. Monson, Jr.
J. L. Zwingle